

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street P.O. Box 2050 Oakland, CA 94607-4756 (510) 464-7942 fax: (510) 433-5542 tedd@abag.ca.gov abag.ca.gov/gointpolicy/

Date: March 5, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Participation on

the Joint Policy Committee

As reported at the last JPC meeting, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has requested membership in the Joint Policy Committee. A letter from BCDC's Executive Director reporting a unanimous Commission decision to that effect is attached.

Full BCDC membership on the JPC, including voting privileges, requires a change in state legislation, and a draft spot bill to effect that change has been prepared by Legislative Counsel. Unfortunately the Assembly Member who agreed to author the bill has exceeded his bill limit, and so the proposed legislation is currently orphaned. We are confident, however, that it will be possible to graft the draft bill's language into other legislation if the JPC agrees to invite BCDC to become a member.

Staff believes that BCDC membership on the JPC would be a positive addition. BCDC has comprehensive planning and regulatory authority in all nine Bay Area counties for the Bay, Suisun Marsh and their shorelines, and through that authority plays a critical role in the land-use and transportation future of the Bay Area. And, as the JPC has already recognized, the potential for sea-level rise gives BCDC a considerable interest in the Committee's continuing consideration of climate change.

Existing legislation provides the JPC with discretion on nearly all matters with the exception of its membership composition and the requirement that it participate in the drafting of certain named regional planning instruments (i.e., the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, and Air Pollution Control Plans and Strategies). As the JPC's work continues, it may be beneficial to add other member agencies in addition to BCDC. The requirement to do this through state legislation seems unnecessarily cumbersome. Therefore, the JPC may wish to seek legislative authority to vary its composition at its will, subject to the maintenance of a core set of agencies with equal representation on the Committee (i.e., ABAG, BAAQMD, and MTC and, conditional on the consideration of this memo, BCDC).

The potential addition of BCDC raises the issue of overall Committee size. As there are currently some vacancies on the JPC, this is also a good time to consider size. The JPC currently has twenty-one voting members, seven from each member agency. The Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing (BTH) is a non-voting member. Subject to maintaining equal repre-

sentation from all member agencies and at least one member from each of the nine Bay Area counties, the JPC has self-authority over its size. The JPC last considered the issue of size in November of 2004, when the Air District was added as a member. At that time, the Committee expanded from an initial fourteen to twenty-one members.

Committee size involves a balance between objectives. A larger committee increases representation from local governments across the region and may assist in achieving greater local buy-in to regional priorities. However, as committee size grows, the quality and fullness of participation may suffer. There is less opportunity for each member to speak and to respond to the ideas of others, and members may discount the value of their presence: the less exclusive the club, the less incentive there is to join.

Assuming that the JPC is not inclined to create a situation wherein some member agencies are more equal than others, a range of reasonably feasible committee size options, incorporating BCDC as a fourth, equally represented member agency, is outlined in this simple multiplication table.

Agency	Total
Representatives	Committee Size
7	28
6	24
5	20
4	16
3	12

In general, a larger committee is more likely to have a more diffuse regional focus, including more local-government interests in addition to regional-agency interests. A smaller committee is more likely to concentrate on issues among the four regional agencies and is less likely to represent local diversity. Staff believes that a good balance is around the current committee size and therefore favors five representatives from each agency comprising a total committee of twenty plus the non-voting Secretary of BTH.

With four member agencies and equal representations, all options result in even numbers and the possibility of tie votes. While a potential problem, it is unlikely to occur often if at all. From a regional policy perspective, it is clearly preferable to favor near consensus over situations involving close votes.

Recommendations

I RECOMMEND:

A. THAT the JPC accept BCDC's request to become a Committee member and that it do so on the basis that BCDC will eventually have representation and status equal to the other member agencies;

- B. THAT the JPC seek legislation giving it the authority to invite BCDC and other relevant agencies to join the Committee as full members as appropriate and required;
- C. THAT, pending legislation permitting BCDC to become a full voting member agency, it be invited to send non-voting members to participate in the JPC's meetings;
- D. THAT the JPC be composed of five representatives from each member agency plus the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing as a non-voting member.



December 7, 2006

Mark Ross, Chair Joint Policy Committee MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607-4756

ATTENTION: Ted Droettboom

Dear Mr. Ross:

I am pleased to inform you that our Commission unanimously decided today to request that BCDC be invited to participate as a member of the Joint Policy Committee. Our Commissioners concluded that BCDC's participation on the JPC would advance a number of objectives in BCDC's strategic plan, which call for greater collaboration with other regional agencies to address critical issues such as climate change, regional sustainability, transportation, air quality and natural resource protection.

We recognize that BCDC's participation may initially present some organizational difficulties in that the current membership of the JPC is established by State law. Because we believe the Joint Policy Committee provides a critical forum at which BCDC and the other agencies can gain a better understanding of each other's work and can foster the development of consistent policy on regional issues, we are open to participating in whatever manner the JPC feels would be most effective.

Please let me know how we can most constructively proceed on this matter.

Sincerely,

WILL TRAVIS
Executive Director